

Remarks

Claim Status:

Claims 1 – 55 were originally presented for examination in this application. On March 3, 2006, Applicants filed a preliminary amendment in which claims 56 – 74 were added. An office action issued on December 15, 2006, rejecting claims 1 – 74 as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0233238 to Lahdesmaki (“Lahdesmaki”). In response thereto, Applicants amended claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-21, 23-30, 33-38 and 52, cancelled claims 3, 12, 13, 22, 31, 32, 40-51 and 53-74 and added new claims 75 and 76.

A final office action issued on July 13, 2007, in which the Examiner noted objections to the Oath and Declaration as filed and claims 7, 26 and 52 and rejected all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in light of Lahdesmaki. In this response, Applicants have amended claim 26 to address the Examiner’s objections and place the claims in condition for appeal. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the originally filed claims and specification, and at least at paragraph [0039] of the application as published. No new matter has been added.

Objection to the Oath/Declaration

A new Oath and Declaration is submitted herewith to address the Examiner’s objection to the originally filed Oath.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 26

As reflected in the claim listing above, Applicants have amended claim 26 to address the Examiner’s rejection. Applicants believe that claim 7 as previously amended and submitted is correct, in that the item selected from the second list is presented between the items selected from the first and third list, respectively.

Claim 52

Claim 52 was objected to based on the language “machine-readable medium” allegedly not being disclosed in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree. At paragraph [0048] of the specification as published, Applicants specifically describe the use of “flash memory” that “stores operating code for the set top box as well as a browser that is used to retrieve and display the UI.” Because flash memory is but one example of machine readable medium that may be used to store computing instructions, Applicants believe this claim is supported by the specification.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that, in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the objections to claims 7, 26 and 52 have been addressed. If, in the Examiner’s opinion, a telephonic interview would expedite the favorable prosecution of the present application, the undersigned attorney would welcome the opportunity to discuss any outstanding issues and to work with the Examiner toward placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 8, 2007

Electronic signature: /Joel E. Lehrer
Joel E. Lehrer
Reg. No. 56,401
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 051414
Goodwin | Procter LLP
Exchange Place
53 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1057
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231